

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, and 15 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 2, and 15 can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0003]. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-13, 15-18, and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rigsby et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,556,971). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The teachings of Rigsby et al. are generally directed toward computer implemented speech recognition system training. In particular, the Examiner relies on Rigsby et al. to teach training a system to select a displayed icon by voice by selecting the displayed icon and providing a speech input to be associated with that icon and later used to select that icon. The Examiner erroneously remarks that the icon can later be selected by voice at any time. However, it should be noted that the icon must be displayed in order for the user to be able to subsequently select the icon by voice (col. 7, line 63-col. 8, line 5) and that doing so only traverses the menu structure by one step, such that no path sequence of menu navigation steps is executed in response to a single utterance of the user. The Examiner also erroneously relies on Rigsby et al. to teach identifying a navigation path via user navigation to said first location through said menu structure from a user-selected point in said menu structure, said path being identified as a sequence of steps executed by a user in manipulating a manual user

interface from a user-selected point to a first location, and storing the navigation path as a sequence of navigation steps leading to said first location. However, it should be noted that the sequence indicated by the Examiner as being taught by Rigsby et al. is a vehicle alignment sequence and not a path sequence for navigating to a menu location by sequential manipulation of a manual user interface that results in user navigation through a menu structure to the menu location. Nor do Rigsby et al. teach automatically performing such a path sequence in order to navigate to the location in response to the user input of the speech utterance. Rather, Rigsby et al. teach performing at most a single step of menu navigation, as opposed to a sequence of menu navigation steps. In particular, the voice utterance of Rigsby et al. at most selects an icon representing a vehicle alignment sequence, which does not result in automatic performance of a sequence of menu navigation steps in order to navigate to a stored location.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward identifying a user-selected navigation path sequence through a menu structure to a location within the menu in response to user navigation to the first location via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of the electronic product, binding a first user voice input to that path sequence, and subsequently automatically performing the path sequence to navigate to that menu location upon receipt of a second user voice input that matches the first one. For example, independent claim 2, especially as amended, recites, "identifying a user-selected navigation path sequence through said menu structure to a first location within said menu in response to user navigation to said first location via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of said electronic product ... associating said first utterance with said navigation path sequence ... matching said second utterance

with said model of said first utterance to retrieve said navigation path sequence associated with said first utterance; and using said retrieved navigation path sequence to navigate to said first location within said menu using said retrieved navigation path sequence to navigate to said first location within said menu by automatically performing said path sequence in response to said matching.” Independent claims 1 and 15, especially as amended, recite similar subject matter. Thus, Rigsby et al. do not teach all of the limitations of the independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 10-14 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rigsby et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,556,971) in view of De Armas et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,873,064). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The teachings of Rigsby et al. are generally directed toward computer implemented speech recognition system training. In particular, the Examiner relies on Rigsby et al. to teach training a system to select a displayed icon by voice by selecting the displayed icon and providing a speech input to be associated with that icon and later used to select that icon. The Examiner erroneously remarks that the icon can later be selected by voice at any time. However, it should be noted that the icon must be displayed in order for the user to be able to subsequently select the icon by voice (col. 7, line 63-col. 8, line 5) and that doing so only traverses the menu structure by one step, such that no path sequence of menu navigation steps is executed in response to a single utterance

of the user. The Examiner also erroneously relies on Rigsby et al. to teach identifying a navigation path via user navigation to said first location through said menu structure from a user-selected point in said menu structure, said path being identified as a sequence of steps executed by a user in manipulating a manual user interface from a user-selected point to a first location, and storing the navigation path as a sequence of navigation steps leading to said first location. However, it should be noted that the sequence indicated by the Examiner as being taught by Rigsby et al. is a vehicle alignment sequence and not a path sequence for navigating to a menu location by sequential manipulation of a manual user interface that results in user navigation through a menu structure to the menu location. Nor do Rigsby et al. teach automatically performing such a path sequence in order to navigate to the location in response to the user input of the speech utterance. Rather, Rigsby et al. teach performing at most a single step of menu navigation, as opposed to a sequence of menu navigation steps. In particular, the voice utterance of Rigsby et al. at most selects an icon representing a vehicle alignment sequence, which does not result in automatic performance of a sequence of menu navigation steps in order to navigate to a stored location. Thus, Rigsby et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate identifying a user-selected navigation path sequence through a menu structure to a first location within the menu in response to user navigation to the first location via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of the electronic product, binding a first user voice input to that path sequence, and subsequently automatically performing the path sequence to navigate to that menu location upon receipt of a second user voice input that matches the first one.

The teachings of De Armas et al. are generally directed toward a multi-action voice macro method. In particular, the Examiner relies on De Armas et al. to teach identifying a menu location in the form of a sub-context object or window object. However, De Armas et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate identifying a user-selected navigation path sequence through a menu structure to a first location within the menu in response to user navigation to the first location via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of the electronic product, binding a first user voice input to that path sequence, and subsequently automatically performing the path sequence to navigate to that menu location upon receipt of a second user voice input that matches the first one.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward identifying a user-selected navigation path sequence through a menu structure to a location within the menu in response to user navigation to the first location via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of the electronic product, binding a first user voice input to that path sequence, and subsequently automatically performing the path sequence to navigate to that menu location upon receipt of a second user voice input that matches the first one. For example, independent claim 2, especially as amended, recites, "identifying a user-selected navigation path sequence through said menu structure to a first location within said menu in response to user navigation to said first location via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of said electronic product ... associating said first utterance with said navigation path sequence ... matching said second utterance with said model of said first utterance to retrieve said navigation path sequence associated with said first utterance; and using said retrieved navigation path sequence to navigate to said first location within said menu using said retrieved navigation path

sequence to navigate to said first location within said menu by automatically performing said path sequence in response to said matching.” Independent claim 15, especially as amended, recites similar subject matter. Thus, Rigsby et al. and De Armas et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate all of the limitations of the independent claims.

The differences between Applicants’ claimed invention and the combination suggested by the Examiner are significant because Applicants’ claimed invention is capable of allowing the user to specify a navigation path sequence for navigating through a menu structure by manually manipulating a user interface in order to arrive at a desired location, bind a user utterance to the path sequence, and then cause the path sequence to be performed automatically by speaking the utterance. This capability is important because having to use a voice command for every menu navigation step in order to arrive at the location is tiresome, time consuming, and prone to encounter more recognition problems than in the case of automatically performing a sequence of menu navigation steps in response to a single utterance. These difficulties are not alleviated by the teachings of Rigsby et al. and De Armas et al. Therefore, allowing the user to identify a menu navigation path sequence for voice binding by sequentially navigating to that location via a manual user interface, followed by automatic performance of the path sequence upon subsequent match of the utterance is significant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 1, 2006

By: Gregory Stobbs  
Gregory A. Stobbs  
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600